IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RITA MERCADO,

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

v.

SUGARHOUSE HSP GAMING, L.P., SUGARHOUSE HSP GAMING, L.P. DBA SUGARHOUSE CASINO, SUGARHOUSE HSP GAMING PROP. GP, L.L.C., DOMINICK MONTANARO, JAY TARBELL, NO. 18-3641

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 23rd day of July, 2019, upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 18), Plaintiff's Response in opposition thereto (ECF No. 20), and Defendants' Reply in support thereof (ECF No. 21), IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.

The Motion is **GRANTED AS UNOPPOSED** with regard to the following claims:

- 1. Counts I, III, and VI, insofar as those claims rely on a failure to promote theory;
- 2. Count VI, as against Defendants Montanaro or Tarbell; and
- 3. Counts II, IV, V, VII, and VIII in their entirety.

The Motion is **DENIED** with regard to Counts I, III, and VI insofar as those claims rely on theories of hostile work environment and constructive termination, and are asserted against the Sugarhouse Defendants.

BY THE COURT:

WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.